

PLANNING AHEAD

Notes for the Planning Community

Volume 2, Issue 9

November / December 1999

In This Issue

Notes from Jim Johnson	1
Abandoned Mine Land Restoration Workshop	2
Stream Corridor Restoration Showcases ON THE WEB!	4
Precedent-Setting Dam Removal Project in North Carolina	4
Water Supply Opportunities in the Southeast	5
Dependable Yield Mitigation Storage	6
Chatham County Wetland Mitigation Site Selection Study	6
Pulling Together the Recreation Pieces—Reservoir and River Visitation and NED & RED Benefits ..	7
Upcoming Transportation Research Board Meeting	9
Questionnaire Guidance Now On the Web	10
Environmental Compliance	11
Tailored Commerce and Vessel Statistics: Navigation Data Center's Service to Corps Districts	11
Partnership Paper	12
Environmental PROSPECT Courses—FY 2000	13
Subscribing to Planning Ahead	14
Submissions Deadline	14

(Ed. Note – We have inserted hyper links in the Table of Contents to allow you to jump to specific articles. To return to the Table of Contents, click on the [book icon](#).)

Notes from Jim Johnson

As you are aware, we are involved in several initiatives at Headquarters to improve the way we do business and the way we can support the field. Over the next few months, I will be discussing these initiatives and how they affect field planners and project delivery teams.


One of these major initiatives is the revision of ER 1105-2-100, the Planning Guidance Notebook. This revision will take place in several stages, so a little background may be helpful for you to understand what to expect and when. The current Planning Guidance Notebook consists of eight chapters and seventeen appendices; the main body of the regulation runs over 600 pages. The new Planning Guidance will consist of four chapters and eight appendices; the main body of the regulation will run about 75 pages. That's the good news; however, the appendices will run about 600 pages.

Your initial reaction may be: "What have we gained?" Well, for the first time since we have produced planning guidance, we have a relatively clear, concise document that provides an overview of

the planning process and sufficient detail to understand that process. It will allow everyone involved in the planning process, i.e., project planners, project delivery teams, project partners and the public with an understanding of our planning process and requirements.

Now, more about this revision taking place in several stages. In order to assure continuity of our planning guidance while we reduced the main body of the regulation, we have initially placed the detailed technical guidance for project planners into the eight appendices. By doing this, we can assure that we didn't inadvertently leave out important guidance while not burdening the main document with those details. We have already initiated the next stage in revising our guidance; that involves a review of our current detailed procedures for each benefit evaluation category to investigate process improvements consistent with the Principles and Guidelines and existing laws. Those benefit evaluation improvements will take longer, and we didn't want to hold up streamlining the Planning Guidance Notebook until they are completed.

I expect to complete the first stage in revising the Planning Guidance Notebook early in 2000, after getting Headquarters review and limited field review. The official guidance will be maintained on the Corps web site; however, we anticipate that printed copies of the regulation (but not the appendices) can be provided to project partners and the public. Everyone will be welcome to access the web site to read the appendices or to assure they have the latest official version of the regulation.

What should you expect when you read our new guidance? First and foremost, the Principles and Guidelines continue to provide the foundation for our planning guidance. Second, we will place renewed emphasis on some fundamental elements of the Principles and Guidelines. For instance, we will emphasize reasonableness in carrying out the planning process. We will also place greater emphasis on being responsive to State and local concerns; we can do that by strong partnering with State and local governments as well as other Federal agencies. And perhaps most importantly, we will seek to underscore how our ecosystem restoration, flood protection and navigation missions in combination allow us to address and balance economic development and environmental needs, in watersheds and in urban environments. 

Abandoned Mine Land Restoration Workshop

Beverly Getzen – CECW-PF & Lynn Martin - CEWRC

CECW and CERD co-hosted a very successful and productive workshop on the subject of abandoned mine land (AML) reclamation and restoration at West Virginia University. The purposes of the workshop were to explore the nature and extent of Corps involvement in AML, identify opportunities for and obstacles to increasing Corps involvement in AML, identify technology support needs, and identify opportunities for the Corps to partner with ADTI and other agencies on AML initiatives. Attendees discussed issues and opportunities related to reclamation and restoration of abandoned mine lands. Almost every Corps MSC, some districts and most of the Corps labs sent representatives to this meeting. The Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI) members also participated along with representatives of most Federal agencies which have programs devoted to mine reclamation. Representatives from various state agencies, universities and private industry also participated. Several participants came from the western states in which the problem set includes noncoal and metallic mines.

Representatives from OSM and BLM outlined their programs related to AML and discussed future opportunities. ADTI members discussed existing technologies for mine restoration, primarily acid


mine drainage which has been the focus of most of their funding so far. However, since the workshop goals included comprehensive coverage of the full range of mine land restoration issues, discussions also included non-coal, metal and other mining problems. It was noted that AML concerns are not only environmental, but also include health and safety. Some states have identified addressing health and safety concerns as their highest priority need.

Corps field representatives presented summaries and analyses of the extent and scope of ongoing activities, and discussed the problems and opportunities in their regions. Western Corps representatives discussed the RAMS authorization in WRDA '99, their ongoing work with the Western Governors Associations and the National Mining Association, and the MOU developed to coordinate AML efforts among SPD, NWD and POD. They noted that those states which are not eligible for SMCRA funding are particularly concerned about finding programs to meet their needs.

At the end of the discussion sessions, participants presented some recommendations to the HQ team to address in developing further guidance for Corps districts and labs in pursuing this business growth opportunity. Since there are many thousands of abandoned mine sites throughout the US, some on Federal lands, there are obvious opportunities to apply Corps expertise in many areas, including ecosystem restoration on the recovered sites. However, there are obstacles, not the least of which are the issues of land ownership and liability, which sometimes make restoration efforts difficult to implement without good State or Tribal partners. One common theme which emerged was the need to implement the Clean Water Action Plan and participants recommended adoption nationwide of the watershed approach to problem solving since it is evident that spot-by-spot solutions are ineffective in many ways, especially in situations of polluted runoff.

The workshop included an excellent field trip to several sites in West Virginia where acid drainage from abandoned mines has created severe or even disastrous conditions in streams (pH in the range of 2 to 3!). ADTI members conducted tours at sites where they had developed and applied methods for treating the acid runoff inside the mines in a few cases, and at the outflow sites in others, which had made significant contributions to changing the pH in the streams locally. In some reaches of streams, however, the problems are so pervasive that improvements at one site may be overwhelmed by the acid input from other nearby, untreated sites. The field trip was quite a revelation for those unfamiliar with the magnitude of the problem.

ADTI and the other agencies expressed their enthusiasm for continued collaboration and partnering with the Corps. BLM already has an MOU with Omaha District for assistance on BLM lands and there is an initiative at HQ to enter into an agreement with the USFS to provide assistance on USFS properties. The National Mining Association, in cooperation with others, has expressed great interest in having the Corps become more involved in AML restoration as a mission.

IWR will use the results of this workshop in preparing a policy paper for HQ. The Corps labs already have some expertise relevant to supporting CW involvement in AML, but will pursue further development of technology support to increase Corps involvement in this area based on the results of this workshop. Contact Beverley Getzen [(202) 761-1980] or Lynn Martin [(703) 428-8065] for further information. 


Stream Corridor Restoration Showcases ON THE WEB!

Beverley B. Getzen - CECW-PF

One Key Action in the Clean Water Action Plan was the designation of 12 National Stream Corridor Restoration Showcases. The 12 were selected by the CWAP Principals on 11 May 1999. Since then, the interagency team (which also prepared the Stream Corridor Restoration Handbook) has been working to load the website with information on the 12 selected streams--with the assistance of the teams that submitted the winning nominees. Information and pictures for all 12 of the Showcase Watersheds are now on the web at <http://www.epa.gov/owow/showcase>. The Showcase Watersheds are:

Duck Creek, AK	Big Nance Creek, AL
Gila River, AZ/NM	Suwanee River, GA/FL
Bear Creek, IA	Sun River Basin, MT
Blackfoot River, MT	Carson River, NV
McCoy Creek, OR	Lititz Run, PA
White River, VT	Duwamish-Green River, WA

Noel Gilbrough, in the Seattle District, nominated the Duwamish-Green River. Other streams on the list did include the Corps as a cooperating agency as noted on the website. Check the website given above for information on the 12 showcases. Also check the stream corridor restoration website at http://www.usda.gov/stream_restoration/ to download a copy of the stream corridor restoration handbook. Stream Corridor Restoration: Principles, Processes, and Practices received a highly favorable review in the Ecological Restoration journal (Vol. 17, pp. 99-100). The review states: "Well written throughout, and supported by terrific graphics and copious case studies, Stream Corridor Restoration is a tremendous guide to the ecological, technical and social aspects of stream corridor restoration. I cannot recommend it highly enough." Dick Dibuono in CECW-E has hard copies of the handbook for distribution to field offices.

Congratulations again to NWD and NWS for an excellent example of watershed restoration. 

Precedent-Setting Dam Removal Project in North Carolina

Dennis Barnett – CESAD


On December 1, 1999 the third dam removal project in North Carolina in two years purely for environmental restoration purposes commenced on the Little River, about 40 miles east of Raleigh. The project is the result of the efforts of a host of partners, including the Wilmington District, working together under the auspices of the Coastal America Partnership. Coastal America brings together all Federal agencies who have responsibilities in coastal watersheds to collaborate and leverage their resources and expertise, along with state and local partners, to protect and restore these ecosystems.

The 71-year old Rains Mill Dam near Princeton, NC no longer serves any useful purpose. Significant environmental benefits will result from the removal of the 250-foot-long, 12-foot-high dam. Access will be restored to about 50 miles of spawning and rearing habitat for seven species of anadromous fish, and habitat will be increased for the endangered dwarf wedge mussel and the endangered Tar River spiny mussel.

Coastal America partners worked for over a year to plan and implement the removal. The Federal partners include US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Marine Corps, US Army Corps of Engineers, and a number of others which have been peripherally involved. The state of North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Division of Water Resources) has led the overall team effort, and several private interests have been involved, including the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the owners of the dam and adjacent lands (descendents of the original builder/owner).

Combat engineers from the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), Cherry Point, NC, are using C-4 plastic explosives to reduce the concrete dam to rubble as a training exercise that provides collateral environmental benefits. The blasting takes about three days to complete. This is the first time that military units have participated in an environmental restoration project of this type. A contractor to the state of North Carolina will subsequently remove the rubble and restore the site. The entire project will be completed by January 2000.

The US Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, provided environmental planning assistance and developed the necessary environmental documentation to support the project by using the Section 22 (Planning Assistance to States) Program. The District staff provided valuable advice and support to the other partners as the plan evolved.

On December 1, the Marine Corps blasted the first section of the dam. A dedication ceremony preceded the blast. Participants include the Secretary of Interior, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources, high ranking USMC officers, Wilmington District Engineer, many agency and media representatives, and members of the public. 

Water Supply Opportunities in the Southeast

Todd Boatman – CELRN

The Nashville District, along with the Great Lakes and Rivers Division, and the South Atlantic Division, are working towards regional solutions to water supply problems throughout the Southeast. They are part of the Southeast Water Supply Roundtable, which members include local, state, and federal legislators and agencies, as well as, environmental interest groups, industry leaders, and engineering consultants.

The Southeast understands that growing water supply conflicts are making it difficult to protect water quality while, at the same time, maintain a strong economic development. The purpose of the Roundtable is to confront these problems and help shape water policy in their region. Over 100 participants of the Roundtable met in Atlanta in early November to help develop strategies for addressing the problems and begin the process of articulating a detailed action plan, or road map, outlining the steps necessary for implementation of these strategies.

Water shortages, competition over scarce supplies, and conflicts over offshore versus instream needs do not respect political boundaries, and the Corps is increasingly being asked to help solve these conflicts. “The Roundtable sees the Corps as a valuable tool that can carry out regional approaches through their technical expertise, and as facilitators among the other federal agencies”, says David Feldman with the University of Tennessee’s Energy, Environment & Resources Center. Mr. Feldman is the chairman of the Roundtable Steering Committee.

The Southeast Water Supply Roundtable will continue to provide a forum for decision makers to identify the entire region's high-priority needs. It will also suggest specific actions for addressing these needs. In the process, the Roundtable may help the region avoid arbitrated settlements by encouraging greater cooperation and the Corps may become a key tool in accomplishing this worthwhile endeavor.

If you would like to know more about the Roundtable's efforts, please contact Todd Boatman of the Nashville District Planning Branch at (615) 736-7194 or Todd.H.Boatman@usace.army.mil.




Dependable Yield Mitigation Storage

Ted Hillyer – CEWRC-IWR-P

Headquarters has just released EC 1105-2-216, "Reallocation of Flood Control Storage to Municipal and Industrial Water Supply – Compensation Considerations." This Engineer Circular establishes policy and provides supplemental guidance on analyzing and implementing compensation requirements to existing water supply and/or hydropower users in the event flood control storage is reallocated to municipal and industrial water supply. Procedures and requirements are provided for the analysis and implementation of Dependable Yield Mitigation Storage (DYMS) to compensate water supply users and, where appropriate, to compensate hydropower users through operational changes. All other basic requirements of reallocation procedures remain in effect as expressed in the Planning Guidance Notebook, ER 1105-2-100.

The development of this circular was a team effort headed by Steve Cone (CECW-AR) and Lillian Almodovar (CECW-PD). Developers and reviewers from the MSC's and districts included Ron Hula (CESWD) (since retired), Jim Barton (CENWD), Jerry Canupp (CESAD), Deal Stone (CESWL), and Jan Holsomback (CESWT). The EC was coordinated with the Southwestern and Southeastern power administrations.

The guidance of this EC will be incorporated into the revised version of ER 1105-2-100, which is expected to be released in the near future. The EC can be found at Planning's Homepage and HQUSACE Publications Homepage. 


Chatham County Wetland Mitigation Site Selection Study

Terry Stratton - CESAS-PD-S

This project, conducted under the Planning Assistance to States (PAS) Program took a pro-active approach to identify potential freshwater wetland mitigation banking sites in the Savannah and Ogeechee River Basins in Chatham County, Georgia. The County Engineer recognizes unavoidable wetlands impacts will occur with current and future development and wants to establish a county owned and operated mitigation bank as a cost effective method to provide for required mitigation. The study objective was to identify and rank potential wetland mitigation sites within the County and recommend which sites are most practical for further study and development. Study cost was estimated at \$70,000 and length of study 9 to 12 months.

The selection criteria for mitigation sites was based on the guidance found in *Guidelines on the Establishment and Operation of Wetland Mitigation Banks*, developed jointly by USACE; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region IV; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Region 5; the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Southeast Region; and the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (GDNR). The search was concentrated on sites that would be suitable primarily for restoration or enhancement of freshwater, forested wetland habitat.

From this survey, a total of 30 sites have been identified. Limited field reviews have been conducted on most of the sites and include a preliminary calculation of potential mitigation credits. Since the majority of the 30 listed sites meet some or all of the selection criteria, selection of the sites within each basin is based primarily upon the size of the site, mitigation effort required, and investigator's knowledge of the intrinsic nature of the site (acquired from site visits and/or aerial photo interpretation). Of the original 30 study sites, six were recommended as excellent candidate sites and 4 as good candidate sites.

Following completion of the original study objective, more detailed study is being conducted on three selected mitigation sites. We expect to complete this work by December 1999. Following the study, the County is planning to maintain the site list for future needs of the County and other interested parties. 

Pulling Together the Recreation Pieces—Reservoir and River Visitation and NED & RED Benefits

Jim Henderson, CEERD-EL (formerly WES)

Since the mid 1980s, focus has shifted from construction to operational changes of major river systems. These reevaluations and changes in operations—in comprehensive, watershed or special studies-- have resulted from changing water demands of stakeholders. On each water resource study, recreation use was considered in evaluation of alternative operating plans. The interests of a range of stakeholders and downstream and tributary recreation users have required expanding the recreation analyses beyond the reservoir visitation and NED evaluations seen in the past. This article describes the recreation evaluation models developed to meet the decision needs for the Willamette Basin, Oregon Feasibility Study. The study was initiated to determine if the Willamette reservoirs could be operated to better meet present and future needs.

In recent decades, public water demands have been altered because of changes in recreation patterns, population distribution, water quality needs, fishery management, and endangered species protection. Municipal water demands in the metropolitan Portland area, a recognized need to improve water quality in the Willamette River mainstem, unused agricultural storage, and changing requirements for endangered species prompted the reevaluation of reservoir operations.

During 1996, there were over 9 million recreation days of use at the 11 operating projects and 5 river reaches of the Willamette Basin-- 6.47 million day use recreation days and 2.67 million overnight use recreation days. Expenditures for recreation trips to Willamette destinations in 1996 were in excess of \$200 million, resulting in sales and jobs for mom and pop bait shops, RV parks, and fast food restaurants. Recreation related expenditures are important since recreation and tourism has been identified as a key strategy for Willamette communities to recover from the loss of the timber industry.

Recreation changes are measured by reservoir and river visitation, economic value of recreation to the nation—the NED benefits, and the impacts to local economies from recreation expenditures—the RED benefits.

Reservoir Recreation: The reservoir recreation model fuses a regional visitation model and travel cost benefit model-- fitting the Regional Recreation Demand Model approach (Ward et al 1996) to Pacific Northwest conditions. As in other regional analyses, water levels, facilities, and population proximity were important predictors of reservoir use. Analyses of Willamette recreation patterns identified an additional potential determinant of recreation not required for previous regional recreation models—weather. The occurrences of days that are warm enough for water contact recreation was an important determinant of recreation. Precipitation was not significant in determining demand for recreation. Two popular recreation projects—Detroit and Fern Ridge—were given priority in determining which projects should provide water to meet downstream needs. In formulating alternatives, the recreation pools at Detroit and Fern Ridge would be kept as high as possible, releasing water from the other projects first. To account for these effects of pool size on recreation demand a water level substitute index was used in the reservoir visitation model.

River Recreation: The visitation estimates from *The Oregon Lakes and Rivers Recreation Survey* indicated that about half of all visitation occurred at the river sites. There were no data on historic visitation that could be used to develop a visitation model that is similar to the reservoirs. To evaluate river recreation changes related to water levels, recreation suitability curves (Shelby and Whittaker 1995) were developed for boating and fishing using an expert survey of river guides and outfitters. For each river reach and activity combination, curves were developed that identified: optimal river flows (in cubic feet per second) (actually a range of flows over which recreation was optimal); minimal flow below which flow is too low for recreation (F_{MIN}); and a higher flow where conditions are too swift or deep for recreation (F_{MAX}). If flows are below F_{MIN} or above F_{MAX} , visitation is assumed to be zero. Flow levels from the alternatives are used to estimate visitation using the suitability curves and 1996 visitation as a baseline visitation level.

National Economic Development (NED) Benefits: Travel cost models—using the cost of travel and time to infer willingness to pay and demand for recreation—were developed to estimate economic benefits. Four TCM's were estimated – separate models for day use and overnight use at reservoir and river locations. They estimated economic benefits for the 33 county market area as a function of travel costs, county demographics, and facilities.

Regional Economic Development (RED) Benefits: The communities around the Willamette reservoirs and rivers are similar to towns near most reservoirs in the nation. Changes in reservoir operations that could affect spending for goods and services in these towns are of great local interest. Expenditure information from the *Lakes and Rivers Recreation Survey* provided detailed data on expenditures for the visitor's most recent trip to one of the 16 study sites. Local economic impact models developed for the Corps (Propst et al. 1998) were used to estimate the total local sales, the increase in local income, and additional number of local jobs generated because of recreation expenditures.

So how are alternatives evaluated? Alternatives for changing the operations of the Corps' Willamette reservoirs to meet future water needs are being formulated. The alternatives have four components or operating criteria: (1) Flow augmentation for the Willamette mainstem; (2) Minimum flow requirements for river reaches below each dam; (3) Drawdown priorities between reservoirs to support recreation at the most popular reservoirs, Fern Ridge and Detroit; and (4) individual elevation targets for reservoir pools, to improve downstream fisheries and water quality. The operating criteria specified for an alternative by (1)-(4) above are used in the basin's hydrologic model to simulate years of high or low water conditions or to evaluate reservoir and river conditions.


The major outputs of the hydrologic models are the monthly reservoir and river water levels. The visitation, travel costs, and regional economic models are driven by the reservoir and river water levels produced by the hydrologic models. The water levels are used in the visitation models to predict monthly visitation. The visitation, travel distances, and demographic information are used in the travel cost models to estimate NED benefits. The visitation estimates are used with the expenditure profiles to estimate recreational spending for the regional economic models.

As alternative formulation was starting in 1998, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a notice to list the steelhead trout and Chinook salmon as threatened species throughout the Willamette Basin. This action resulted in the alternative formulation process being suspended, until a recovery plan for steelhead and salmon is developed by biologists in NMFS and Oregon Department of Fish and Game.

Summary: The need to provide answers to recreation questions beyond the “how many recreation days” and NED analysis seen in past feasibility studies has been expanded here to meet needs of Willamette recreation visitors and study partners to: account for region specific demand variables—weather and interrelationship of reservoir water levels incorporate the river recreation use, and link recreation visitation to spending and effects on local economies.

A steelhead trout and Chinook salmon recovery plan is scheduled for completion in the spring of 2000. This will enable the Portland District and the study partners to resume formulation of alternatives to meet study objectives while protecting the sensitive fish. For further information on the recreation models, contact Jim Henderson henderj@mail.wes.army.mil, or 601-634-3305.

References

- Propst, D.B., Stynes, D.J., Chang, W., and Jackson, R.S. (1998). “Estimating the local economic impacts of recreation at Corps of Engineer projects—1996,” Technical Report R-98-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Shelby, B. and Whittaker, D. (1995). “Flows and recreation quality on the Dolores River: integrating overall and specific evaluations,” *Rivers* 5(2), pp. 121-132.
- Ward, F.A. Roach, B.A. Loomis, J., Ready, R.C., and Henderson, J.E. (1996). “Regional recreation demand models for large reservoirs: database development, model estimation, and management applications,” Technical report R-96-2, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. 

Upcoming Transportation Research Board Meeting

Kenneth E. Lichtman, IWR-N

The Annual Meeting of the National Research Council’s Transportation Research Board will be held between January 9 – 13, 2000 in Washington, D.C. The annual meeting of the Transportation Research Board is one of the largest forums in the world for information exchange among transportation professionals.


One of the highlights of this year's program will be a session chaired by MG Hans Van Winkle, Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works, USACE, to be held on January 12th. The title of the session is *Next Steps After Passage of WRDA 99: Getting Vital Port and Waterway Projects Underway and Looking Ahead to WRDA 2000*. The location of the session will be at the Omni Shoreham Hotel – Diplomat Room, beginning 2:30 p.m.

Joining MG Van Winkle on the panel will be Mr. Larry J. Prather, Chief of the Policy Guidance Branch at HQUSACE; Mr. Benjamin H. Grumbles, Senior Counsel, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment; Ms. Chelsea Henderson, Senior Staff, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works; Mr. W. Norbert Whitlock, Senior Vice President, American Commercial Barge Lines Company and current Chair of the Inland Waterways Users Board; and Mr. Frank L. Hamons, Manager, Harbor Development, Maryland Port Authority.

Immediately following the session chaired by MG Van Winkle a second panel will continue the discussion of the future activities concerning water resources development. The second panel will be held in the same location and will begin at 4:00. Mr. Harry N. Cook, President of the National Waterways Conference, Inc, will chair this second panel. Joining Mr. Cook on the panel will be Mr. Thomas F. (Fred) Caver, Jr., Chief, Programs Management Division, HQUSACE. Mr. Caver will be discussing the need to increase the amount of financial resources in support of the nation's water related infrastructure.

Also expected to appear on the second panel are: Mr. Thomas H. Wakeman III, Dredging Program Manager, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; Mr. Jon Amdur, Director of Maritime Operations, Port of Oakland, CA; Mr. Chris J. Brescia, President, Midwest Area River Coalition (MARC) 2000; and Mr. Alan Willis, Manager, Channel Improvement, Port of Portland, OR.

In addition to the WRDA 99 session there are many other activities scheduled during the TRB Annual Meeting which address water resource development related issues including sessions on environmental risk issues facing ports (with Dr. Lewis E. Link of HQUSACE, Research and Development as a panelist); developments on the inland waterway system; electronic navigation and its impact on safety and operations; and the effect of "just in time" delivery systems on port rationalization.

For more information on these sessions or registering to attend the Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, you can visit the TRB's website at www.national-academies.org/trb/meeting. 

Questionnaire Guidance Now On the Web

Stuart Davis – CEWC-IWR-R


All Corps surveys of 10 or more nonfederal government people must comply with OMB and Corps of Engineer guidelines. This requirement applies to flood damage surveys, navigation surveys, environmental surveys, customer satisfaction surveys, and all others, whether or not they are administered directly by the Corps, its contractors, or local sponsors of Corps studies. Current requirements for conducting survey research, and the compendium of OMB-approved questions are now available on the IWR web site. The site explains new requirements, including the process for obtaining specific OMB approval each time a survey is administered. One requirement is that the Corps division points of contact submit a summary of all planning surveys performed in the last fiscal year should be submitted to Ron Conner at CECW-PD. The summary should contain an accounting of the purpose, location, number of

respondents, and total burden hours for each survey. (Stuart Davis, CEWRC-IWR-R, 703/428-7086)
<http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/omb/html/OMBHOMEA.HTM> 

Environmental Compliance

Ellen Cummings – CECW-PD

Everything goes in cycles and recently it appears that we are sliding backwards with regard to our attitude towards environmental compliance. This is even true for our ecosystem restoration projects. For example, many of the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) submittals lack documentation of Endangered Species Act compliance which indicates consideration of the current list of endangered species, the Clean Air Act compliance is noted as N/A when compliance with this Act is always required, and the Water Quality Certificate has not been issued. HQ and ASA (CW) are concerned about this trend and in recent cases involving at least one project and several PCAs, ASA (CW) has failed to provide approval until the compliance issues were resolved. Since projects must be in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act prior to approval, it is hard to imagine how they cannot be in compliance with all environmental statutes at this point. This is one of the things considered when reports are reviewed at HQ and should be one of the items considered by MSCs for delegated approvals.

There is one exception, and only one. Several states refuse to grant water quality certification until plans and specifications are substantially complete. This has been a problem for individually authorized projects with multiple phases, since the state may not grant certification for the entire project prior to PCA review. It may also be a problem for section 1135 and section 206 projects, if the sponsor wants to receive credit for work done during the plans and specifications stage. Allowing credit for this work-in-kind requires execution of the PCA early in the plans and specifications stage. CECW-AR is working with OASA (CW) to revise policy to address the water quality certification issue. The proposed solution will require addition of language to the PCA and obtaining a statement from the state, based upon its review of the decision document the PCA is to be based upon, indicating there appear to be no problems with obtaining a water quality certificate at the appropriate time. Water quality certificates must be obtained prior to contract award. Ms. Kim Smith, CECW-AR, should be contacted to obtain specific guidance with regard to this issue prior to submission of a PCA for review. 

Tailored Commerce and Vessel Statistics: Navigation Data Center's Service to Corps Districts

Edward Drinkert and Charlotte Cook - CEWRC-NDC-C

The Navigation Data Center's Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center (WCSC) answers many special requests from the Corps districts using "The Oracle Waterborne System (TOWS)" database. Examples of some recent requests demonstrate WCSC's flexibility in answering questions demanding greater specificity of geography and time.

Geographically Specific

Past One or More Point(s): WCSC, using TOWS, can extract from the database vessel/commodity movements that pass any number of points along waterways and channels. For

example, New Orleans District requested vessel/ commodity information for traffic traversing the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock that originated on the upper Mississippi River. WCSC identified one point to represent the lower end of the upper Mississippi and another point to represent the IHNC Lock. The computer program found all the movements that passed both points.


Between Two Points: The TOWS database allows for the definition of a waterway segment by identifying two milepoints. The Rock Island District requested tonnage by commodity group, by state, for the upper Mississippi River miles 449 through 506, for years 1990 through 1998. WCSC's "on-a-reach" computer program selected all commodity movements passing into, out of, or through the designated reach. The data were summarized by year, state, and commodity group to meet the district's request.

By Waterway/Port/Location/Dock/Link: The TOWS database provides the ability to define customized areas by waterway, port, location, dock, or link. A contractor working for the Galveston District requested total tonnage for several non-published waterways. The waterways were defined in terms of groups of waterway network links, and the tonnage was computed accordingly. The Vicksburg District requested tonnage figures for a non-published port, Yellow Bend Port. The three location codes, which comprise Yellow Bend Port, were used to calculate the total tonnage.

Time Periods

By Month/Quarter: The TOWS database allows the consolidation of information based on the month/quarter that the movement took place. In order to do a seasonal analysis of commodity flows, barge movement data by commodity (corn and soybeans) by month was requested for the Illinois River for years 1993 through 1998. Such information can be provided in Dbase, Access, Excel, Lotus, ASCII, or in hard copy form.

Summary

The TOWS software and database at WCSC are quite versatile. If you can draw an area, line, or point(s) on a map, WCSC can generate the tonnage and trip information associated with it. The hardest part is acquiring the data and making sure it is accurate, but that is the subject of another article! 


Partnership Paper

Cornell Pippens CENAD-ET-P

I have completed a draft Partnership Paper, which explains various methods and list various sources of funds for non-Federal sponsors to generate corporate funding for Civil Works (CW) projects. Local sponsors may not be fully aware of all possible funding methods and/or sources to offset their non-Federal share of CW projects. The purpose of the document is to assist, aid or direct readers to explore potential funding methods and/or sources for the non-Federal share, when cash on hand is not available.

The document includes several financial methods such as: In-Kind Services In Lieu of Cash; Special Taxes or Fees; Funds Control Methods; Multi-Sponsorship; Third Party Sub-Agreement to Sole Sponsorship; Grants; Bonds; Loans; Credits and The Ability to Pay Analysis. The Partnership Paper explains how these methods could be applied to study only, project only or both the study/projects non-Federal costs. Several Federal, non-Federal, regional, state and private sources are listed in this report; however, the list does not include all possible available sources. This is a living document that will be

continually updated and expanded as additional funding sources and/or financing methods become available.


The document was given to the North Atlantic Division (NAD) Strategic Planning Team (SPT) to research additional sources, contact districts, USACE, and other appropriate officials. Additional efforts will include the necessary action to put the document on the web supplementary to SPT efforts. For copies of the Partnership Paper or to provide comments contact Mr. Samuel P. Tosi or Mr. Cornell Pippens of CENAD-ET-P at 718-491-8719/8725. 

Environmental PROSPECT Courses—FY 2000

John Buckley - CEHR-P-T

Listed below are the FY2000 training agent environmental PROSPECT courses in which spaces are still available. If interested in enrolling in any of these courses, you will need to obtain the DD Form 1556, Request for Training, and have it submitted through your local training office to the Registrar's Office in Huntsville, AL.

Ctl No	Course Title	1 City	State	Start Date	End Date	Tuition
263	COASTAL ECOLOGY	MONTEREY	CA	8-May-00	12-May-00	\$2,700
168	ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES	VICKSBURG	MS	15-May-00	19-May-00	\$1,680
264	ECOS PLN/MGT ISSUES	NEW ORLEANS	LA	24-Jul-00	28-Jul-00	\$1,520
280	ECOSYSTEM RESTORATN	VICKSBURG	MS	22-May-00	26-May-00	\$1,730
275	ENG/DES CONST WETLND	ORLANDO	FL	6-Mar-00	10-Mar-00	\$2,250
272	FUND WETLANDS	ANNAPOLIS	MD	5-Jun-00	9-Jun-00	\$1,900
272	FUND WETLANDS	OLYMPIA	WA	7-Aug-00	11-Aug-00	\$1,900
440	HYDRO CONSTR MIT WET ##	APALACHICOLA	FL	28-Feb-00	3-Mar-00	\$1,710
140	REGULATORY IV ##	FT. COLLINS	CO	26-Jan-00	30-Jan-00	\$1,640
137	REGULATORY V ##	CENTRAL		10-Jul-00	14-Jul-00	\$1,640
281	RIPARIAN ECOL/MGT	HARLINGEN	TX	1-May-00	5-May-00	\$2,050
281	RIPARIAN ECOL/MGT	MISSOULA	MT	26-Jun-00	30-Jun-00	\$2,050
161	RIVER & WETLANDS	DAVIS	CA	11-Sep-00	15-Sep-00	\$1,870
285	STREAMBANK EROS/PROT	VICKSBURG	MS	27-Mar-00	31-Mar-00	\$1,960
164	WATER & WATERSHED	DAVIS	CA	17-Jul-00	21-Jul-00	\$1,700
261	WATERSHED WORK	BALTIMORE	MD	21-Aug-00	25-Aug-00	\$950
239	WET MIT BANK DEV/MGT	ORLANDO	FL	26-Jun-00	30-Jun-00	\$1,770
276	WETLANDS DEV & REST ##	APALACHICOLA	FL	27-Mar-00	31-Mar-00	\$2,040
276	WETLANDS DEV & REST ##	OLYMPIA	WA	21-Aug-00	25-Aug-00	\$2,040
273	WETLANDS EVAL	MOBILE	AL	27-Mar-00	31-Mar-00	\$2,240

Additional information about these courses can be found in the FY2000 Purple Book (CEHRP 350-1-1) or online at: <http://www.hnd.usace.army.mil/to/pindedx.htm> or from John Buckley. Telephone: 256-895-7431. E-mail: John.P.Buckley@HND01.usace.army.mil 

Subscribing to Planning Ahead

To subscribe or to our distribution list, send an e-mail message to majordomo@eml01.usace.army.mil with no subject line and only a single line of text in the message body.

That single line of text should be: "subscribe ls-planningahead"

To obtain a 'help' file, send only the word 'help' in the text of the message (nothing in the subject line) and address it to majordomo@eml01.usace.army.mil.

The web site for additional information is: <http://eml01.usace.army.mil/other/listserv.html> 

Submissions Deadline

The deadline for material for the next issue is **25 January 2000**. 

Planning Ahead, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, (<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwpnews.htm>) TEL 202-761-1969 or FAX 202-761-1972 or e-mail Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil.